



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

prepared primarily for professed students of the classics, Professor Johnston's volume ought to appeal to a much wider circle. It is a book which every cultivated person may read with interest and profit.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

Roman Historical Sources and Institutions. Edited by HENRY A. SANDERS. [University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Volume I.] (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1904. Pp. iv, 402.)

THE University of Michigan devotes the initial volume of her *Studies* (Humanistic Series) to a collection of essays dealing with Roman historical sources and institutions, under the editorship of Professor Henry A. Sanders. It is gratifying to receive this witness to the vitality at Michigan of a branch of investigation so undeservedly neglected in this country; and we note with satisfaction the announcement that a half-dozen volumes continuing the series are already in preparation. Apart from Professor Dennison's discussion of the singing of the "Sæcular" Hymn, all the papers are historical in theme. They display diligence and zeal; in view of our American failure to insist upon drill in clear and easy English composition as a preliminary to historical writing, it is perhaps ungracious to object to their literary baldness and disjointedness; but none of the essays shows a facile pen.

Miss Mary G. Williams of Mt. Holyoke follows up her *Julia Domna* (*American Journal of Archaeology*, 2d series, VI, 259-305) of 1902 with a similar study of Julia Mamæa. This is accurate and exhaustive. Dr. Duane R. Stuart investigates Dio Cassius's use of epigraphic material, and reaffirms the earlier verdict of negligence. Professor Drake takes Cauer's tabulation (now over twenty years old!) of inscriptions relating to officers below the centurion's rank, and traces the rise and decline of the *principalitas* in the pre-Diocletian army. Dr. G. H. Allen of Cincinnati presents a valuable study of centurions as substitute commanders, based on the inscriptions.

Professor Sanders's two disquisitions occupy well toward one-half the volume. In the first, he collects all versions of the Tarpeia myth, following Krahner, and adds some allied stories. Two of these, Persian myths whose irrelevancy he admits, are quoted in French and German versions long since superseded; another, a Charlemagne story found in the *Chronicon Novaceliense* (3, 14), is taken, without indication of ultimate origin, from Grimm's *Deutsche Sagen!* The whole study would have gained greatly by compression and elimination; it is hard to winnow out the wheat, and even the sensible discussion of the origin of the myth lacks clearness. Misprints (especially in the Greek quotations) and inconveniences are too frequent. Nonius and Gellius are cited from old texts with readings now abandoned. After the Nissen-Haupt controversy and Döhner's excellent dissertation, it is strange to be referred back to Schmidt on Zonaras's use of Plutarch.

In his discussion of the lost Epitome of Livy, Professor Sanders does himself greater justice. He criticizes Reinhold's and Drescher's recent dissertations and continues and defends his thesis of 1897, in which he showed that this abridgment was composed as early as Tiberius's reign. The correct attribution of later statements to this vanished condensation of Livy is a peculiarly delicate task, as has been well pointed out by Schwartz apropos of Dio Cassius. Professor Sanders has collected numerous resemblances of statement in late historians, and his general conclusions agree with those of earlier investigators and are certainly sound; but the aptness of several of his parallelisms must remain a matter of opinion. The collection has however a permanent value for all students of Roman historical tradition. From Pliny's citation of *Livius filius* as a source for a portion of book 5, in which we do find a fragment of the Epitome, and from one or two other indications, Professor Sanders ventures to guess that the historian's son was his abridger. What a pity, since this study was not already published when the discovery of the Oxyrhynchus fragment was heralded, that the volume was not held and the essay worked over in the light which the new abstract throws upon the whole subject, as just pointed out by Professors Moore of Harvard and Kornemann of Tübingen!

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

Seven Roman Statesmen of the Later Republic. By CHARLES W. C. OMAN, M.A. (London: Edward Arnold; New York: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1902. Pp. viii, 348.)

THE seven statesmen are the two Gracchi, Sulla, Crassus, the younger Cato, Pompey, and Cæsar. Their lives, as Mr. Oman points out (p. 11), "completely cover the last century of Rome's *ancien régime*"; or, more precisely, they cover the course of the Roman revolution. The *ancien régime* received a fatal shock when Tiberius Gracchus appealed to the direct expression of the popular will without regard to the checks and balances of the constitution. In reality he thus forced the issue of personal versus constitutional government; and this was not finally settled until Augustus found a *modus vivendi* for both, that the lion and the lamb might lie down together, with the lamb, as it proved, ultimately inside. In the nature of the issue we have one reason why the story of the hundred years required for its settlement may well be told in a series of biographical studies. Each of Mr. Oman's seven statesmen, with the exception of Cato, whose career after all might have been quite as well left to incidental treatment as that of Marius or of Cicero, represented the monarchical principle, each more distinctly than his predecessor. Thus the true meaning of the whole process, as Mr. Oman indicates in his preface, may be brought out by concentrating attention upon the personal element.

Although the cardinal facts of the story are common property and allow of no radically new explanation, yet they are invested with new